

REMARKS

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections set forth in the Office Action dated January 19, 2007.

SUMMARY

Claims 1 – 16 were cancelled.

Claim 17 is amended.

Claims 19 – 20, 22 – 23, and 26 – 30 were withdrawn by the Examiner.

Claim 31 is added. No new matter was added as a result.

Claims 17 – 18, 21 and 24 – 25 are currently pending.

ELECTIONS/RESTRICTIONS

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's election of group 1, corresponding to claims 17 – 18, 21, and 24 - 25. Claim 17 is currently generic.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 17 – 18 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,097,458).

Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, the plurality of the concave portions are formed continuously to each other and are arranged irregularly adjacent to each other.

Tsuda et al. fail to teach a plurality of the concave portions are formed continuously to each other and are arranged irregularly adjacent to each other. Tsuda et al. are thus at best ambiguous as to a plurality of the concave portions are formed continuously to each other and are arranged irregularly adjacent to each other. It is well settled that an anticipation rejection cannot be predicated on an ambiguous reference (In re Turlay, 304 F.2d 893, 899 134 USPQ 355, 360(CCPA 1962)). For at least this reason Claim 17 is allowable over the cited reference.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 17, 21, and 25 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,736) in view of Tsuda et al. Claim 24 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,166,793). Claims 25 was rejected pursuant to 35 u.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuda et al. in view of Sasaki et al.

Claim 17 is allowable over the cited references. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the plurality of the concave portions being formed continuously to each other and being arranged irregularly adjacent to each other. Accordingly, claim 17 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 21 is also allowable over the cited references for additional reasons that are independent of those discussed above. A prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. The Examiner stated it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Tsuda et al. and Sasaki et al. for “reflecting light incident thereon toward particular direction” (Office Action dated January 19, 2007; page 8). However, the teachings of Tsuda et al. render the arrangement of Sasaki et al. unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Sasaki et al. teach concave portions with a curved bottom. Such concave portions allow the reflector “to restrict a reflection of light from a non-required direction and perform an efficient reflection of light incident from a specified direction around a specified direction” (col. 5, lines 2 – 7). Tsuda et al. teach concave portions with flat bottoms. Accordingly, if combined, the arrangement disclosed by Sasaki et al. would be unable to efficiently reflect light from a non-required direction. Therefore, there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Tsuda et al. and Sasaki et al.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 31 was added. No new matter was added as a result. Claim 31 depends from allowable claim 17, so is allowable for at least this reason. Further limitations of claim 31 are allowable over the cited references. For example, claim 31 recites each of the concave portions are formed by a pressing process using an indenter, the shape of

each inner surface of each concave portion being defined by the shape of an end portion of the indenter.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendment and remarks, the Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If for any reason, the Examiner believes that the amendment and remarks do not put the claims in condition for allowance, the undersigned attorney can be reached at (312) 321-4200 to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./
Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200